



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

opinions or feelings, if in the light of the whole they shall require it.

It is therefore with diffidence that I would venture the opinion that the book is open to the criticism of endeavoring to formulate stylistic history within the limits of too simple a scheme. The problems are, I fear, vastly more complex than one would gather from Norden's treatment. So, for example, I question whether the personal element, which we formulate in the dictum of Buffon—*le style est l'homme même*—can be so largely eliminated as is done by Norden (p. 11). There was to be sure, as he points out, the rhetorical theory which made style dependent on subject-matter, and independent of personality, but in practice is the theory confirmed in antiquity (for its applicability to Tacitus is far from certain), unless in the case of some trifling rhetorician, such as Apuleius, to whom no style was a vital expression of character, and whose facility of change had, I suspect, much the same ethical significance as the 'style' which in certain grades of society is 'put on.' One may question, too, whether the regular recurrence of typical vices of style in all periods justifies in all cases the inference of historical connection with a given source. But that the elements to which Norden gives predominate significance are present and of wide influence no one will deny in the face of the evidence which is here arrayed, and to have drawn these lines sharply through the whole history of ancient style is an Herculean service, for which the author may be confident of the gratitude of literary students throughout the world.

Jan. 15, 1899.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

Homère. Étude historique et critique. Par VICTOR TERRET, Professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun. Paris, Albert Fontemoing, 1899.

In a recent number of the Journal (A. J. P. XIX 346) I deprecated the premature introduction of the Homeric Question into the cycle of secondary studies. It can not fail to cool the ardor of the young student so readily kindled by the dramatic interest of Iliad and Odyssey; and to show how far I should be willing to go, I cited M. Victor Terret as an ensample to the flock. The *professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun* has read a great deal about Homer. The bibliography appended to his book takes up some 114 pages and covers the ground from 1795 to 1898. Being arranged chronologically and not topically, it is of the least conceivable practical value, even if the numerous misspellings did not breed distrust. Still, it is fair to suppose that the author has dipped into a large part of the works that he has cited in the text, if not all those he has cited in the bibliography. Into this stream of learning he stepped a unitarian. Out of it he stepped a

unitarian, and to an unbelieving generation and to those who would fain believe, some slight sketch of the portly volume may be interesting. Whether M. Terret's faith will save his book alive is another matter.

Homer, it seems, was born in Asia Minor and belongs to the Ionian race. The old contest as to his birthplace is settled in favor of Smyrna. The Greek epopee was composed at Chios. Homer is an historical personage, but the details of his life are unknown. There is every presumption that the text of his poems has been preserved intact by oral tradition—that is, substantially intact—for Aristarchus took the various editions in hand, and his *diorthosis* served as the basis of what is our *vulgata*. A great man was Aristarchus, but he suffered a sad eclipse of faith, if indeed it is true that he regarded the last book of the Odyssey as a spurious additament. Such a concession is as when one letteth out water. We all know the perils that environ the man who excises the last verses of St. Mark and obelizes the verse of the Three Witnesses. Crates of Mallos was a fanciful soul, but he was strong in the faith. He believed in the one Homer. Even the devils like Zoilus believed, although, unlike the orthodox devils, they did not tremble. Then there arose in the bosom of the Church the Separatists, who ascribed the Iliad and the Odyssey to different authors, in the same heretical spirit as that which divides the body of Isaiah. They had, however, no certain hold, and Seneca scouts their quibbles as Rabelais mocks at the futile controversies of the scholastics. Moderns have taken up the same line and pointed out the differences between the two poems in religion, morals and politics, the differences in art. There are differences but there are no dissidences. There is no great gulf fixed. The poems differ as the spheres differ, but the characters abide. The Ulysses of the Iliad is the Ulysses of the Odyssey, and the Helen of the one is the Helen of the other. There is no reason to believe in the superior civilization of the Odyssey. There is no East, no West. The civilization of both poems rests on the gold basis. In any case, what changes may not half a century produce in culture in composition? And the Iliad belongs to the morning, the Odyssey to the evening of Homer's life. Witness the difference between Hamlet and The Tempest, as set forth by M. Guizot. Then the diction is the same, the style is the same in the two poems. To be sure, when one is so poor a proof-reader of Greek as M. Victor Terret, one becomes happily inaccessible to the small discrepancies that agitate other scholars.

The fact is that the faith in the personality of Homer was undisturbed down to the close of the seventeenth century. Why, Fénelon proved the existence of God by the existence of Homer. Then the skeptics arose. While France was engaged in all manner of frivolities the Germans were working at Greek, and then came a renaissance of Greek studies. But the renaissance of Greek studies is as dangerous as the renaissance of Biblical

studies. The Elohist and the Jahvist take shape in the same century that gives birth to that Demogorgon, Wolf. Wolf was an unsanctified soul like his forerunner, Astruc. His incisive language, his violent temper and his literary vanity plunged him into difficulties with the leading scholars of Germany. He sought distraction in travel, and was about to betake himself to Italy when he died, at Marseilles, Aug. 8, 1824, at the age of sixty-five years. "By an odd irony of fate he still rests in the ancient city of the Phocaeans, where the cult of Homer was always held in honor." An odd irony of fate? Why not, M. Terret, a judgment of God?

Still, humanly speaking, the *Prolegomena* is a fine work of erudition, composed with the rigorous method that belongs to a scientific treatise. But compliments like this are always a flourish preliminary to fatal transfixion. Wolf's book staggered Goethe, but Goethe recovered his balance. Schiller never lost his, and it was well; for the rigorous scientific method has proved a failure. Wolf's notions as to the limitations of early poetic art are mere affirmations. His arguments for the late age of writing have been disposed of by Hissarlik and Cyprus. The bulk of the Iliad could not have interfered with the recital of it at festivals. Add up the verses of the dramatic pieces performed at the Dionysia and the sum amounts to more than the sixteen thousand verses of the Iliad. Exit Wolf.

The poetry of Homer differs so much from other Indo-European epopees that the unity of the Greek epic stands out in triumphant contrast. The critical dissection of the poems and the long array of inconsistencies amount to nothing. Modern literature abounds in errors that are just as flagrant, if not more so. Shakespeare and Schiller would fall into the same condemnation as Homer. French authors seem to have escaped. The language of Homer gives no hold to the notion of the diverse origin of the different books. It is useless to go into the matter, if one could. Differences have been pointed out, but they are not vital. The epic dialect is a literary idiom which had ripened by the tenth century and was ready for the hand of the great artist who supervened. This is M. Georges Perrot's judgment. Fick's theory of the Ionization of Aeolic songs, rejected by Maurice Croiset and Georges Perrot, has been finally disposed of by Zuretti. Helbig and Rayet, by the study of contemporary art, have vindicated Homer's truthfulness to his own time. *Summa summarum*. One does not hesitate to conclude, with Charles Thurot, that the dissection of the poems of Homer is the fundamental sin of modern philology.

This conclusion having been reached, the book might have stopped at the 128th page. But your true exorciser resorts to all his means, bell, book and candle, to lay the evil spirit, and there is yet to come an analysis of the Iliad with a refutation of all objections to the unity, and the like of the Odyssey. So many

eminent literary men are unitarians, so many eminent scholars assume the attitude of St. Michael when contending with the devil, that the time spent with M. Terret is pleasantly beguiled. Sainte-Beuve's practised hand sketches an outline of the Iliad. Lamartine, 'the French Homer,' utters an eloquent protest against "all these incredulities, these vestiges of the antique envy which has pursued the grand old man down to posterity"—an envy from which the French Homer doubtless felt that he himself was not free. But delightful as the book is, the limitations of the Journal in space and in character, both of which have already been violated in this notice, forbid me to follow M. Terret in his refutation of Lachmann and Grote, of Steinthal, Koechly, Kirchhoff, Wilamowitz and Seeck. Like Bossuet in his *Variations des églises protestantes*, M. Terret makes effective use of the divergencies of those who dissent from the faith in the oneness of Homer and the oneness of his poems, and there is something pastoral in his paternal insistence on belief in these fundamental articles. It will not do to find in the Odyssey a certain beauty, a certain dramatic force. Unity of action is the vital beauty of every poetical work. What saith St. Augustin? "*Epist. XVIII, ad Coelest, numerus 2*": *Omnis porro pulchritudinis forma unitas*.

Upon the long analysis of Iliad and Odyssey there follows a chapter on the poetical art of the two poems. In the appended bibliographical part an account is given of the MSS and editions of Homer, together with a long list of books pertaining to Homer. This bibliography has already been characterized. A number of illustrations, more or less capricious, add interest to the volume of 640 pp.

The technical Greek scholar will be fretted at the misprints and other slips. The lover of Homer will be attracted by the enthusiastic student revealed in M. Terret. The Homeric specialist can hardly be expected to find much satisfaction in a book like this. Discontent is the vital breath of the specialist, and I foresee that there are those who will quarrel with me for robbing phonetics in order to pay a tribute to mere literature. But the big book may serve as a temporary bulwark to the practical teacher, who declines to discuss with young boys the miserable patchwork of the *Κόλος μάχη* and the interpolated coquettishness of Penelope (A. J. P. VIII 422).

B. L. G.

Establishment and Extension of the Law of Thurneysen and Havet, by LIONEL HORTON-SMITH. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology.)

Mr. L. Horton-Smith has collected from this Journal (vols. XVI, pp. 444-67, XVII 172-96, and XVIII 43-69, in part) his